An Iterative Interior Point Network Utility Maximization Algorithm

Akhil P T and Rajesh Sundaresan

arXiv:1609.03194v1 [math.OC] 11 Sep 2016

Abstract

Distributed and iterative network utility maximization algorithms, such as the primal-dual algorithms or the network-user decomposition algorithms, often involve trajectories where the iterates may be infeasible. In this paper, we propose a distributed and iterative algorithm that ensures feasibility of the iterates at all times and convergence to the global maximum. A benchmark algorithm due to Kelly et al. [J. of the Oper. Res. Soc., 49(3), 1998] involves fast user updates coupled with slow network updates in the form of additive-increase multiplicative-decrease of suggested user flows. The proposed algorithm may be viewed as one with fast user updates and fast network updates that keeps the iterates feasible at all times. Simulations suggest that our proposed algorithm converges faster than the aforementioned benchmark algorithm.

I. Introduction and the main result

The setting of this paper is similar to that of Kelly et al. [1]. Consider a network with m directed link resources. Let $c(l)$ be the capacity of the link l. There are n users and each has a single fixed path. Each user sends data along its associated path with the first vertex of the path being the source of the user's data and the last vertex being its terminus. Let A be the $m \times n$ matrix with $A_{le} = 1$ if the path e uses link l and $A_{le} = 0$ otherwise. Let $[n]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ of users and let $[m]$ denote the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ of links. Let $w_e : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R},\ e \in [n]$ be the utility functions of the users. User e derives a utility $w_e(x(e))$ when sending a flow of rate $x(e)$. The functions $w_e, e \in [n]$ are assumed to be strictly concave and increasing. Let $x = (x(e), e \in [n])$, $w = (w_e, e \in [n])$, and $c = (c(l), l \in [m])$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{x | x \geq 0 \text{ and } Ax \leq c\}$. Throughout, we make the standing assumption that $\mathcal{A}$ has an interior feasible point, i.e., there exists a point for which all inequalities are strict. The system optimal operating point solves the problem:

This work was supported by the Indo-French Centre for Promotion of Advanced Research under project number 5100-IT1.

$$\text{System}(w, A, c):$$

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \; W(x) := \sum_{e=1}^{n} w_e(x(e)). \tag{1}$$

The catches are that the network operator does not know the utility functions of the users, and the users know neither the rate choices of the other users nor the flow constraints on the network.

Kelly [2] proposed the decomposition of the above problem into two subproblems, one to be solved by each user, and the other to be solved by the network. Let λ_e be the cost per unit rate to user e set by the network, and let p_e be the price user e is willing to pay. The maximization problem solved by user e is

$$\text{User}(w_e; \lambda_e):$$

$$\max_{p_e : p_e \geq 0} \; w_e\left(\frac{p_e}{\lambda_e}\right) - p_e. \tag{2}$$

If $p = (p_e, e \in [n])$ is known to the network, the network's optimization problem is

$$\text{Network}(A, c; p):$$

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \; \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e \log(x(e)). \tag{3}$$

The solution to Network$(A, c; p)$ is well-known to satisfy the so-called proportional fairness criterion: if $\mu_l, l \in [m]$ are the optimal dual price variables associated with the dual to Network$(A, c; p)$, then

$$x(e) = \frac{p_e}{\sum_{l: l \in e} \mu_l}, e \in [n], \tag{4}$$

is the optimal solution to the network problem. Kelly [2] showed that there exist costs per unit rate $(\lambda_e^\star, e \in [n])$, prices $(p_e^\star, e \in [n])$, and flows $(x^\star(e), e \in [n])$, satisfying $p_e^\star = \lambda_e^\star \cdot x^\star(e)$ for $e \in [n]$ such that $p_e^\star$ solves User$(w_e; \lambda_e^\star)$ for $e \in [n]$ and $(x^\star(e), e \in [n])$ solves Network$(A, c; p^\star)$; furthermore, $(x^\star(e), e \in [n])$ is the unique solution to System(w, A, c). The costs per unit rate satisfy $\lambda_e^\star = \sum_{l: l \in e} \mu_l^\star$ for some dual price variables.

In order to ensure operation at $x^\star$, taking the information asymmetry constraints into account, Kelly et al. [1] proposed the following *fast user adaptation* dynamics:

$$p_e(t) = x(e,t) \cdot w_e'(x(e,t)),\ e \in [n], \tag{5}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(e,t) = \kappa \cdot \left(p_e(t) - x(e,t) \cdot \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l(t) \right),\ e \in [n], \tag{6}$$

$$\mu_l(t) = \psi_l \left(\sum_{e:e\ni l} x(e,t) \right), \quad l \in [m], \tag{7}$$

where $\psi_l(y)$ is a penalty[1] or cost per unit flow when the total flow in the link is y. It signifies the level of congestion in that link. Thus $\mu_l(t)$ in (7) is the cost per unit flow through link l, and may be interpreted as a dual variable of the network problem. The optimal dual variables for Network$(A, c; p)$ are such that the net cost of user e flow matches the price p_e paid by that user; see (4). The network, adapts the flow $x(e,t)$ using an additive-increase multiplicative-decrease scheme as in (6); the network therefore attempts to equalize, albeit slowly, the instantaneous net cost of user e flow, $x(e,t) \cdot \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l(t)$, to the instantaneous price paid by that user, $p_e(t)$. On the other hand, if we differentiate (2) with respect to p_e and use the relation $p_e(t) = \lambda_e(t) \cdot x(e,t)$, we get that $p_e(t)$ in (5) maximizes User$(w_e; \lambda_e(t))$. So the users adapt *instantaneously* (in comparison to the network's slower speed of adaptation) to the congestion signal. Kelly et al. [1] provided a Lyapunov function for the dynamical system defined by (5)-(7). The stable equilibrium point of the dynamical system maximizes a relaxation of the system problem, as determined by the choice of $\psi_l(\cdot)$ in (7).

Despite the popularity of this approach, there are two issues we would like to highlight.

- $x(t)$ may not remain feasible at all times t.
- $x(t)$ converges to the optimal value of a relaxation of the system problem.

The first of these issues was highlighted in Johansson et al. [3]. The dynamics (5)-(7) cannot then be used in systems where feasibility has to be ensured at all times. The second of these issues is often circumvented via iterative algorithms where the Lagrange multipliers or penalty functions are also adapted (see for example, Arrow and Hurwicz [4], Low and Lapsley [5], Chiang et al. [6], Palomar and Chiang [7]). Such approaches either assume knowledge of the utility functions at the network end or may encounter infeasible iterates, or both.

The literature on network utility maximization is vast and we will not be able to do justice to all of them. However, there are two works, Hochbaum [8] and La and Anantharam [9],

[1]Kelly et al. [1] suggest two functions as examples, one of which is $\psi_l(y) = (y - c(l) + \varepsilon)^+/\varepsilon^2$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

that are very relevant to our contribution which we bring to the reader's attention. A greedy algorithm proposed by Hochbaum [8] can be adapted to solve the system problem with iterates remaining feasible at all times and without full knowledge of the utility functions at the network side. Though the algorithm circumvents both the problems highlighted above, it works only when the set of feasible flows forms the "independent set of a polymatroid". This is the case when the network has, for example, a single source and multiple sinks or when the network has multiple sources but a single sink.

Mo and Walrand [10] proposed a window-based rate control mechanism that converges to the solution to Network$(A, c; p)$ for a fixed p. The window update rule of [10] uses only delay information provided to the user (propagation and round-trip delays). La and Anantharam [9] proposed two algorithms that solve the system problem using the decomposition of Kelly et al. [1]. The first algorithm incorporates the solution to the user problem into the window update rule of [10]. The second algorithm of La and Anantharam [9] explicitly finds the solution to the user problem and the network problem in each iteration. Although their simulations showed the convergence of the algorithm for general networks, a mathematical proof was given only for the case of a network with a single link. Their algorithm additionally imposes more stringent conditions on the utility functions than those assumed in this paper.

In this paper, we propose a discrete-time algorithm (see Algorithm 1 below) that remains feasible at all times and converges to the global maximum of System(w, A, c). The corresponding continuous time dynamics also shares the same properties. Our algorithm can be considered as a generalization of the algorithm of La and Anantharam [9] to 1) more general networks, and 2) a larger class of objective functions.

For a set of flows, abusing notation, write $p_e(x(e)) := x(e) \cdot w_e'(x(e))$ as per (5), and set $p(x) = (p_e(x(e)), e \in [n])$. Write

$$T(x) := \arg\max_{y \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \log(y(e)) \tag{8}$$

for the solution to Network$(A, c; p(x))$. If $p_e(x(e)) = 0$ for some e, then the objective function in (8) is not strictly concave over $\mathcal{A}$. The optimization problem (8) may then have multiple solutions, and so $T(x)$ is to be viewed as a set-valued mapping whose values are convex and compact subsets of $\mathcal{A}$. Define $a_k := \frac{1}{k+1}, k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

Algorithm 1: 1) Initialize $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x^{(0)}(e) > 0,\ e \in [n]$. Initialize $k = 0$.

2) User update:

$$p_e^{(k)} = x^{(k)}(e) \cdot w_e'(x^{(k)}(e)),\ e \in [n]. \tag{9}$$

3) Network update:

Find a point $v \in T(x^{(k)})$ and set:

$$x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + a_{k+1}(v - x^{(k)}). \tag{10}$$

4) Set $k \leftarrow k + 1$ and go to step 2.

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1: Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has an interior feasible point. The iterates $x^{(k)}$ of Algorithm 1 converge to the optimal solution $x^\star$ to the system problem, i.e., $x^{(k)} \to x^\star$ as $k \to \infty$.

Observe that, in Algorithm 1, the users exhibit the same fast adaptation as in the dynamics (5). But in the network update, iterate $x^{(k+1)}$ is a convex combination of $x^{(k)}$ and $v \in T(x^{(k)})$ which, by induction, remains in the feasible set for all k. This resolves the feasibility issue in the dynamics of (5)-(7). In the proof we will argue that the iterates track the differential inclusion

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) \in T(x(t)) - x(t); \tag{11}$$

we will in fact see that the solution to this differential inclusion remains feasible at all times.

Theorem 1 also states that the iterates converge to the global optimum of the system problem. This resolves the issue that the dynamics (5)-(7) converge to the solution to a relaxed problem different from the original system problem.

The main technical issues to surmount are 1) the dynamics in (11) have multiple fixed points and it is nontrivial to show convergence to the global optimum; 2) $T(x)$ is not necessarily a continuous function of x.

Algorithm 1 assumes the existence of a central entity that computes the solution to Network$(A, c; p)$, i.e. $T(x)$. Section III describes algorithms to compute $T(x)$ efficiently for some class of networks. The assumption regarding the existence of a central entity is not crucial. An alternative is to use Mo and Walrand's algorithm [10] that finds $T(x)$ for a fixed p; that algorithm uses only the information available at the user end. The p can then be adapted (user updates) at a slower time scale. This allows for the use of Algorithm 1 in large scale networks in a distributed setting.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we prove Theorem 1. In Section III, we address the complexity of identifying the proportionally fair solution point for the network problem. We provide an example of a network where flows aggregate into a 'main branch', reminiscent of traffic from the suburbs flowing into an arterial highway leading to

the downtown of a large city, for which the complexity to solve the network problem is $\mathcal{O}(n)$. We also argue that this complexity is manageable ($\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$ plus computations for feasibility checks) in situations where the feasible set is a polymatroid, for example, when all flows either originate or terminate at a single vertex. We also demonstrate via simulations that the dynamics in (11) converge to the equilibrium at a faster rate than the dynamics of (5)-(7) for identical speed parameters κ. In Section IV, we end the paper with some concluding remarks.

II. Convergence

The update equation in step 3 of Algorithm 1 is a standard stochastic approximation scheme but without the stochasticity. A common method to analyze the asymptotic behavior of such schemes is the dynamical systems approach based on the theory of ordinary differential equations (ODE). But $T(x)$ being a set valued map necessitates the use of differential inclusions.

The outline of the proof is as follows. We will first characterize the fixed points of the mapping T. We will then argue that the system optimal point is one of the finitely many fixed points of the mapping T. We will next show that the solution to the differential inclusion in (11) models the asymptotic behavior of the iterates $x^{(k)}$. Following this, We will show that every solution to the differential inclusion converges to one of the fixed points of T via Lyapunov theory. Finally, we will prove that the fixed point to which the solution to the differential inclusion converges as $t \to \infty$ is the system optimal point.

A. Characterization of the fixed points of $T(x)$

Definition 1: A point x is a fixed point of the set valued map T if $x \in T(x)$.

Let $S \subset [n]$. Let $\mathcal{A}|_S$ be the subset of $\mathcal{A}$ whose points have support contained within S. Define a subproblem of the system problem as

$$\text{Subsystem}(w, A, c, S): \quad \max_{y \in \mathcal{A}|_S} \quad \sum_{e \in S} w_e(y(e)). \tag{12}$$

Lemma 1: Let $\overline{x}$ be a fixed point of the mapping T. Let $S = \{e : \overline{x}(e) > 0\}$. Then $\overline{x}$ is the unique optimal solution to the Subsystem(w, A, c, S).

Proof: We have $\overline{x}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in S^c$. If $\lim_{x(e)\downarrow 0} x(e) \cdot w_e'(x(e)) > 0$ for some $e \in S^c$, then any element $y \in T(\overline{x})$ has $y(e) > 0$ which contradicts the fact that $\overline{x}$ is a fixed point. Hence $p_e(\overline{x}(e)) = \overline{x}(e) \cdot w_e'(\overline{x}(e)) = 0$ for all $e \in S^c$, and we may write

$$\overline{x} \in T(\overline{x}) = \arg\max_{y \in \mathcal{A}} \quad \sum_{e \in S} p_e(\overline{x}(e)) \log(y(e)). \tag{13}$$

Since $\overline{x} \in \mathcal{A}|_S \subset \mathcal{A}$, we also have that $\overline{x}$ maximizes (13) over $\mathcal{A}|_S$, i.e.,

$$\overline{x} = \arg\max_{y \in \mathcal{A}|_S} \quad \sum_{e \in S} p_e(\overline{x}(e)) \log(y(e)). \tag{14}$$

Let $\mu_l, l \in [m]$ and $\eta_e, e \in [n]$ be the optimal dual variables for the network subproblem (14). The corresponding Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions are

$$\frac{p_e(\overline{x}(e))}{\overline{x}(e)} = \sum_{l: l \in e} \mu_l - \eta_e, \ \ e \in S, \tag{15}$$

$$\mu_l \cdot \left(\sum_{e: e \ni l} \overline{x}(e) - c(l) \right) = 0, \ \ l \in [m], \tag{16}$$

$$\eta_e \cdot \overline{x}(e) = 0, \ \ e \in [n], \tag{17}$$

$$\eta_e \geq 0, \ \ e \in S, \ \ \mu_l \geq 0, \ \ l \in [m] \text{ and } \overline{x} \in \mathcal{A}|_S. \tag{18}$$

Since $\frac{p_e(\overline{x}(e))}{\overline{x}(e)} = w_e'(\overline{x}(e))$, it is easy to see that equations (15-18) are the KKT conditions of Subsystem(w, A, c, S) as well. Since $\overline{x}/2$ is an interior feasible point of $\mathcal{A}|_S$, KKT conditions are sufficient for optimality in (12) and $\overline{x}$ is the optimal solution to Subsystem(w, A, c, S). Uniqueness follows from the strict concavity of $w_e, e \in S$. ■

Is every solution to Subsystem(w, A, c, S), $S \subset [n]$, a fixed point of the mapping T? The possibility that $\lim_{x(e)\downarrow 0} x(e) \cdot w_e'(x(e)) > 0$ for an $e \in S^c$ and the first step of the proof of Lemma 1 says this is not always true. However, we can assert the following.

Lemma 2: The global maximum of the system problem, $x^\star$, is a fixed point of the mapping T.

Proof: $x^\star$ solves the system problem. Let $S = \{e : x^\star(e) > 0\}$. S can be a proper subset of $[n]$. Let $\mu_l, l \in [m]$ and $\eta_e, e \in [n]$ be the optimal dual variables of the system problem.

We then have

$$w_e'(x^\star(e)) = \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l - \eta_e,\ e \in S, \tag{19}$$

$$w_e'(0) = \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l - \eta_e,\ e \in S^c, \tag{20}$$

$$\mu_l \cdot \left(\sum_{e:e\ni l} x^\star(e) - c(l) \right) = 0,\ l \in [m], \tag{21}$$

$$\eta_e \cdot x^\star(e) = 0,\ e \in [n], \tag{22}$$

$$\eta_e \geq 0,\ e \in [n],\ \mu_l \geq 0,\ l \in [m] \text{ and } x^\star \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{23}$$

Observe that $w_e'(0)$ is finite for an $e \in S^c$; otherwise a small increase in $x^\star(e)$ and a corresponding decrease in $x^\star(i)$ for a suitable $i \in S$ (which has finite $w_i'(x^\star(i))$) will result in a feasible flow that has a larger objective function value. Hence $p_e(x^\star(e)) = 0$ for $e \in S^c$. Since $w_e'(x^\star(e)) = \frac{p_e(x^\star(e))}{x^\star(e)}$ for all $e \in S$, it follows from (19)-(23) that $x^\star, (\mu_l, l \in [m]), (\tilde{\eta}_e = \eta_e, e \in S)$ and $(\tilde{\eta}_e = \eta_e + w_e'(0), e \in S^c)$ satisfy the KKT conditions of the problem (8). Hence $x^\star \in T(x^\star)$. ■

B. Need for the theory of differential inclusions

We now describe the issues that make it necessary to use differential inclusions to study the asymptotic behavior of $x^{(k)}$. $T(x)$ is the set of points that solve (8). If $p_e(x(e)) = 0$ for some e at a point $x \in \mathcal{A}$, then the objective function in (8) is not strictly concave. Hence there can be multiple points that solve (8). A continuous selection from $T(x)$ allows the use of differential equations to analyze the stochastic approximation scheme in (10). A natural question that arises is whether there is such a continuous selection from $T(x)$. We give an example in the Appendix showing that such a selection is not possible.

C. Differential Inclusions: Preliminaries

In this section, we define a differential inclusion and state relevant results from [11] that are used to show the convergence of Algorithm 1. Let $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a set valued map. Consider the following differential inclusion:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} \in F(x). \tag{24}$$

A solution to the differential inclusion in (24) with initial condition $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an absolutely continuous function $x : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies (24) for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The following conditions are sufficient for the existence of a solution to the differential inclusion (24):

1) $F(x)$ is nonempty, convex and compact for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
2) F has a closed graph.
3) For some $K > 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, F satisfies the following condition

$$\sup_{z \in F(x)} ||z|| \leq K(1 + ||x||). \tag{25}$$

The stochastic approximation scheme in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is given as

$$y^{k+1} \in y^{(k)} + a_{k+1}(F(y^{(k)}) + U^{(k+1)}), \tag{26}$$

where a_k satisfy the usual conditions:

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} a_k = 0, \ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \to \infty, \tag{27}$$

and $U^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are deterministic or random perturbations.

Let $t(0) = 0, t(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i$. Let $r_y : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous piece-wise linear function formed by the interpolation of $y^{(k)}$ as in

$$r_y(t) = y^{(k)} + \frac{y^{(k+1)} - y^{(k)}}{t(k+1) - t(k)} \cdot (t - t(k)), \tag{28}$$
$$\forall \ t \in [t(k), t(k+1)).$$

Definition 2: (A perturbed solution to (24)). Let $U : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be locally integrable function such that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \sup_{0 \leq v \leq T} \left|\left| \int_t^v U(s) ds \right|\right| = 0.$$

Let $\delta : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that $\delta(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Define

$$F^{\epsilon}(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists z : ||z - x|| < \epsilon, d(y, F(z)) < \epsilon\}, \tag{29}$$

where $d(y, F(z)) = \inf\{||y - q|| : q \in F(z)\}$. An absolutely continuous function $y : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a perturbed solution to (24) if there exists $U : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\delta : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as above such that

$$\frac{dy}{dt} - U(t) \in F^{\delta(t)}(y(t)). \tag{30}$$

for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

The following lemma, taken from [11], gives conditions on $y^{(k)}$ and $U^{(k)}$ for r_y to be a perturbed solution to (24).

Lemma 3: [11, Prop. 1.3] Suppose $y^{(k)}$ is bounded, i.e., $\sup_k ||y^{(k)}|| < M < \infty$, and for all $T > 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \sup\Bigg\{ \Bigg|\Bigg| \sum_{k=s}^{i-1} a_{k+1} U^{(k+1)} \Bigg|\Bigg| : i = s+1, s+2, \ldots, m(t(s)+T) \Bigg\} = 0, \tag{31}$$

where $m(t) = \sup\{m : t(m) \leq t\}$. Then $r_y(t)$ is a perturbed solution of the differential inclusion (24).

Definition 3: A compact set L is an internally chain transitive set if for any $x, y \in L$ and every $\epsilon > 0, T > 0$, there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$, solutions $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l$ to (24) and $t_i > T, \ \forall \ i$, that satisfy the following.

1) $x_i(t) \in L$ for all $0 \leq t \leq t_i$ and for all $i \in [l]$,
2) $||x_i(t_i) - x_{i+1}(0)|| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \in [l-1]$,
3) $||x_1(0) - x|| \leq \epsilon$ and $||x_l(t_l) - y|| \leq \epsilon$.

We shall call the sequence $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l)$ as an (ϵ, T) chain in L from x to y.

The following lemma, again taken from [11], characterizes the limit set of a perturbed solution.

Lemma 4: [11, Thm. 3.6] Let r be a perturbed solution to (24). Then the limit set of $r(\cdot)$

$$L(r) := \bigcap_{t\geq 0} \{r(s) : s \geq t\}$$

is internally chain transitive.

D. Convergence analysis

We proceed to prove the convergence of $x^{(k)}$ to the optimal solution to the system problem. Observe that T maps points in $\mathcal{A}$ to itself. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define

$$F(x) := T(P_{\mathcal{A}}(x)) - x. \tag{32}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$ is the projection of x onto the set $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 5: For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $F(x)$ is nonempty, convex and compact. Furthermore, F has the closed graph property and satisfies (25).

Proof: The objective function of the network problem is continuous and the constraint set $\mathcal{A}$ is compact. The maximum exists due to the Weierstrass theorem. Also, the set of maximizers is closed and convex. Thus $T(P_{\mathcal{A}}(x))$ is nonempty, convex and compact, and hence so is $F(x)$.

We next prove the closed graph property of F. A function has the closed graph property if it is upper hemicontinuous. The objective function in (8), $\sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \log(y(e))$, is jointly continuous[2] in x and y. Also, the constraint set of the network problem does not vary with x. By Berge's maximum theorem [12, p. 116], $T(x)$ is upper hemicontinuous. Since $P_{\mathcal{A}}(x)$, the projection onto the convex set $\mathcal{A}$, is continuous, the composition $T(P_{\mathcal{A}}(x))$ is upper hemicontinuous. Consequently, $F(x)$ is upper hemicontinuous and hence has the closed graph property.

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{z \in F(x)} ||z|| &= \sup_{z \in T(P_{\mathcal{A}}(x))} ||z - x|| \\
&\leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} ||z - x|| \\
&\leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} ||z|| + ||x|| \\
&\leq K + ||x|| \\
&\leq K(1 + ||x||),
\end{aligned}$$

where $K > \max\{\sup_{z \in \mathcal{A}} ||z||, 1\}$. ■

Lemma 6: Let $r_x(t)$ be obtained by the linear interpolation of $x^{(k)}$ as given in (28). Then $r_x(t)$ is a perturbed solution to the differential inclusion (24) with F defined as in (32).

Proof: We first show that $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}$. Observe that $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume $x^{(k-1)} \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $T(x^{(k-1)}) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x^{(k)}$ is a convex combination of $x^{(k-1)}$ and $T(x^{(k-1)})$, we have $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}$. It follows that

$$F(x^k) = T(P_{\mathcal{A}}(x^{(k)})) - x^{(k)} = T(x^{(k)}) - x^{(k)}.$$

We now see that the update equation in (10) is the same as the stochastic approximation scheme in (26) with $U^{(k)} = 0$ for all k. Observe that $x^{(k)}$ is bounded because $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}$ for

[2]Here we may take $\log(y(e))$ to be continuous at $y(e) = 0$ with $\log 0 \coloneqq -\infty$ because then $\lim_{x(e)\downarrow 0} \log(y(e)) = \log 0$ and this sequential continuity is all that is needed to apply Berge's maximum theorem [12, p. 116]

all k and $\mathcal{A}$ is compact; since $U^{(k+1)} = 0$, the condition in (31) is trivially satisfied. Hence, by Lemma 3, $r_x(t)$ is a perturbed solution. ■

We restrict our attention to solutions of (24) with initial condition $x(0) \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $T(x) \in \mathcal{A}$, $x(t)$ lies in $\mathcal{A}$ for all t. Define

$$\Phi_t(x_0) \coloneqq \{x(t) : x \text{ solves } (24),\ x(0) = x_0\}.$$

Definition 4: Let Λ be a subset of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $V : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that

- $V(y) < V(x),\ y \in \Phi_t(x), x \in \mathcal{A}\backslash\Lambda,$
- $V(y) \leq V(x),\ y \in \Phi_t(x), x \in \Lambda.$

Then V is called a Lyapunov function for Λ.

Define $V : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$V(x) \coloneqq \sum_{e=1}^{n} w_e(x^\star(e)) - \sum_{e=1}^{n} w_e(x(e)). \tag{33}$$

Lemma 7: Let Λ be the set of fixed points of T. The function V in (33) is a Lyapunov function for Λ.

Proof: Let $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $v \in T(x)$. We have, from the definition of $T(x)$ in (8), that

$$\sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \log(v(e)) \geq \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \log(x(e)) \tag{34}$$

because $v \in T(x)$ maximizes the network problem.

If $p_e(x(e)) > 0$ for all e, then the network problem has unique solution. Therefore, equality holds in (34) if and only if $v = x$, i.e, x is a fixed point of the mapping T. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \log \frac{v(e)}{x(e)} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \left(\frac{v(e)}{x(e)} - 1\right) \\ &= \sum_{e=1}^{n} w_e'(x(e))(v(e) - x(e)) \\ &= \nabla W(x) \cdot (v - x), \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where (a) uses the inequality $\log y \leq y - 1$.

More generally, let $p_e(x(e)) > 0$ for $e \in S \subset [n]$ and $p_e(x(e)) = 0$ for $e \in S^c$; in particular, $x(e) = 0$ for $e \in S^c$. Define $\tilde{v}$ to be $\tilde{v}(e) = v(e)1_S(e), e \in [n]$.

The value of the objective function in (8) evaluated at v and $\tilde{v}$ are equal. Hence $\tilde{v} \in T(x)$,

$$\sum_{e \in S} p_e(x(e)) \log(\tilde{v}(e)) \geq \sum_{e \in S} p_e(x(e)) \log(x(e)), \tag{36}$$

and $\tilde{v}$ must be the unique solution to the problem defined in (14). Therefore, (36) holds with equality if and only if $\tilde{v} = x$. Following the steps leading to (35), we have

$$\sum_{e \in S} w_e'(x(e))(\tilde{v}(e) - x(e)) \geq 0 \tag{37}$$

which is a strict inequality if $\tilde{v} \neq x$. Since $v(e) - x(e) \geq 0$ for $e \in S^c$, this along with (37) yields

$$\nabla W(x) \bullet (v - x) \geq 0; \tag{38}$$

since $w_e'(x(e)) = w_e'(0) > 0$ for $e \in S^c$, equality holds in (38) if and only if $v = x$. Hence

$$\frac{dV(x(t))}{dt} = -\nabla W(x(t)) \bullet (v - x(t)) \leq 0, \ \forall \ v \in T(x(t)). \tag{39}$$

The inequality in (39) holds with an equality if and only if $v = x$. Therefore V is a Lyapunov function for Λ. ■

Lemma 8: Let Λ be the set of fixed points of T. Every internally chain transitive set for F in (32) is a singleton that is a subset of Λ.

Proof: By Lemma 1, there are at most finitely many fixed points of the mapping T. Hence the cardinality of the set Λ is finite and $V(\Lambda)$ has empty interior. Also, by Lemma 7, V is a Lyapunov function for Λ. Proposition 3.27 of [11] states that if V is a Lyapunov function for Λ and if $V(\Lambda)$ has an empty interior, then every internally chain transitive set is a subset of Λ.

Choose ϵ small enough so that open balls of radius ϵ centered at each of the finite points Λ are disjoint. Fix $T \geq 0$. Since any (ϵ, T) chain involves remaining in Λ for all time and jumps of size at most ϵ to another point in Λ, by the disjointedness of the ϵ-balls covering Λ, there can be no (ϵ, T) chain in Λ joining two of its distinct points. It follows that the internally chain transitive subsets of Λ are singletons. ■

Lemma 9: The iterates $x^{(k)}$ converges to a fixed point of the mapping T.

Proof: In Lemma 6, we showed that $r_x(t)$ is a perturbed solution to (24). By Lemma 4, the limit set of $r_x(t)$ is internally chain transitive. By Lemma 8, $L(r_x)$ is a singleton and $L(r_x) \subset \Lambda$. Let $\hat{x} \in L(r_x)$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is compact and $\hat{x}$ is the only limit point of the sequence $x^{(k)}$, every subsequence of $x^{(k)}$ has a further subsequence that converges to $\hat{x}$. Hence $x^{(k)}$ converges to $\hat{x}$. ■

In the rest of this section, we show that the iterates converge to $x^\star$, the optimal solution to the system problem.

Let the dual variables of the optimization problem Network$(A, c; p)$ be $\mu_l, l \in [m]$. Kelly et al. [1] simplified the dual to this problem to be:

$$\text{Dual}(p, A, c): \quad \min_{\mu_l \geq 0, l \in [m]} \left(\sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e \cdot \log \frac{1}{\sum_{l: l \in e} \mu_l} + \sum_{l=1}^{m} \mu_l c(l) \right). \tag{40}$$

We now argue that the search for the optimal $\mu_l, l \in [m]$ may be restricted to a compact set.

Lemma 10: The optimization problem in (40) with $p_e = p_e(x(e))$ is equivalent to the following optimization problem. For any $x \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\max_{0 \leq \mu_l \leq 2P/c(l)} \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \cdot \log \left(\sum_{l: l \in e} \mu_l \right) - \sum_{l=1}^{m} \mu_l c(l), \tag{41}$$

where

$$P \coloneqq \max_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{e=1}^{n} x(e) \cdot w_e'(x(e)) < \infty.$$

Proof: Define $R(\mu)$ to be the objective function in (41). For any $\mu_l > 2P/c(l)$, by reducing μ_l, we increase the objective function's value. To see this, it suffices to show that $\frac{\partial R(\mu)}{\partial \mu_l} < 0$ for any $\mu_l > 2P/c(l)$. But this is easily checked as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R(\mu)}{\partial \mu_l} &= \sum_{e: e \ni l} p_e(x(e)) \frac{1}{\sum_{l': l' \in e} \mu_{l'}} - c(l) \\ &\leq \sum_{e: e \ni l} p_e(x(e)) \frac{1}{\mu_l} - c(l) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_l} \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) - c(l) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\mu_l} \left[\max_{x \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{e=1}^{n} p_e(x(e)) \right] - c(l) \\ &= \frac{P}{\mu_l} - c(l) < 0, \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where the last inequality follows if $\mu_l > 2P/c(l)$. ■

Lemma 11: Let $x^{(k)}$ converge to $\hat{x}$, a fixed point of the mapping T. Then $\hat{x} = x^\star$, the optimal solution to the system problem.

Proof: Let $v^{(k+1)}$ solve problem (8) with $p_e = p_e(x^{(k)}(e))$, and so $v^{(k+1)} \in T(x^{(k)})$ satisfies the KKT conditions

$$\frac{p_e(x^{(k)}(e))}{v^{(k+1)}(e)} - \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)} + \eta_e^{(k)} = 0,\ e \in [n], \tag{43}$$

$$\mu_l^{(k)} \cdot \left(\sum_{e:e\ni l} v^{(k+1)}(e) - c(l) \right) = 0,\ l \in [m], \tag{44}$$

$$\eta_e^{(k)} \cdot v^{(k+1)}(e) = 0,\ e \in [n], \tag{45}$$

$$\eta_e^{(k)} \geq 0,\ e \in [n],\ \mu_l^{(k)} \geq 0,\ l \in [m]. \tag{46}$$

Let us first claim that $x^{(k)} > 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. This holds for $k = 0$, the initial point, in Algorithm 1. If, for some k, $x^{(k)} > 0$, then $p_e(x^{(k)}(e)) > 0$ for all e and so, $v^{(k+1)} > 0$ and consequently, $x^{(k+1)}$ being a convex combination of $x^{(k)}$ and $v^{(k+1)}$ also satisfies $x^{(k+1)} > 0$. The claim follows by induction. Since $x^{(k)}(e) > 0$, we have $v^{(k+1)}(e) > 0$, and so, by (45), $\eta_e^{(k)} = 0,\ e \in [n]$. Thus (43) simplifies to

$$\frac{p_e(x^{(k)}(e))}{v^{(k+1)}(e))} = \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)}. \tag{47}$$

Since we also have $p_e(x^{(k)}(e)) > 0$, and $v^{(k+1)}(e) > 0$ in (47), we have $\sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)} > 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} v^{(k+1)}(e) &= \frac{p_e(x^{(k)}(e))}{\sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)}} \\ &= \frac{x^{(k)}(e) \cdot w_e'(x^{(k)}(e))}{\sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Suppose $\hat{x}(e) = 0$. Observe that $x^{(k)}(e) > 0$ for all k. Hence $v^{(k+1)}(e) < x^{(k)}(e)$ infinitely often, which is the same as saying

$$\frac{x^{(k)}(e) w_e'(x^{(k)}(e))}{\sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)}} < x^{(k)}(e) \tag{49}$$

occurs infinitely often. This implies

$$w_e'(x^{(k)}(e)) < \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^{(k)} \tag{50}$$

infinitely often. Consider the subsequence that satisfies (50). Henceforth, let $x^{(k)}$ denote that subsequence. We now make the following observations. In Lemma 10, we showed that $\mu_l^{(k)}$

takes values on a compact set, and so we can find a further subsequence such that $\mu_l^{(k_\tau)} \to \mu_l^\star$ for some $\mu_l^\star$, but for all $l \in [m]$. Since (50) holds for $k = k_\tau$, by letting $\tau \to \infty$, we have

$$w_e'(\hat{x}(e)) \leq \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^\star, \ \forall \ e \text{ such that } \hat{x}(e) = 0 \tag{51}$$

$$w_e'(\hat{x}(e)) = \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^\star, \ \forall \ e \text{ such that } \hat{x}(e) > 0; \tag{52}$$

the latter follows by letting $\tau \to \infty$ in (48) and from $x^{(k+1)} = x^{(k)} + a_k(v^{(k+1)} - x^{(k)})$. Choose

$$\eta^\star(e) = 0 \text{ if } \hat{x}(e) > 0, \tag{53}$$

$$\eta^\star(e) = \sum_{l:l\in e} \mu_l^\star - w_e'(\hat{x}(e)) \text{ if } \hat{x}(e) = 0. \tag{54}$$

Thus, from (51),

$$\eta^\star(e) \cdot \hat{x}(e) = 0 \ \forall \ e \in [n] \text{ and } \eta^\star(e) \geq 0 \ \forall \ e \in [n]. \tag{55}$$

Since (44) and (46) are true for indices k_τ, taking limit as $\tau \to \infty$, we get

$$\mu_l^\star \cdot \left(\sum_{e:e\ni l} \hat{x}(e) - c(l) \right) = 0, \ l \in [m], \tag{56}$$

$$\mu_l^\star \geq 0, \ \forall \ l. \tag{57}$$

Equations (51)-(57) are the KKT conditions for the system problem. Hence $\hat{x} = x^\star$, the optimal solution to the system problem. ■

Proof of Theorem 1: Theorem 1 follows from Lemma 11. ■

III. Algorithmic Complexity and Speed of Convergence

In this section, we remark on the complexity of Algorithm 1. Each iteration of the algorithm has 1) a user update which adapts the amount a user is willing to pay to the network, and 2) a network update which adapts the rates allocated to the users.

Since w_e is known at the user end, w_e' is easy to obtain either numerically or analytically. Hence the user update (9) can be implemented by each user in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ steps.

The network update consists of solving the network problem (8). Its complexity depends on the network structure. We indicate the complexity of the network update for the following simple networks: a polymatroidal network with a single source and multiple sinks or multiple sources and a single sink; a flow aggregating network with the structure in Figure 1.



Fig. 1: Flow aggregating network.

Polymatroidal network: Consider a network with a single source and n sinks. The source sends flows at a rate $x(1), x(2), \ldots, x(n)$ to the sinks. Megiddo [13] showed that the set of feasible flows $(x(e), e \in [n])$ forms the independent set of a polymatroid. Therefore, the network problem is a separable concave maximization over the independent set of a polymatroid. The fastest known algorithm that solves this optimization problem is a scaling based greedy algorithm proposed by Hochbaum [8]. The algorithm obtains an "ϵ-optimal" solution to the network problem in $\mathcal{O}\left(n(\log n + F)\log\frac{B}{n\epsilon}\right)$ where F is the complexity to check whether a certain increase in one of the components of $(x(e), e \in [n])$ would make the flow infeasible. B is the total amount of resource to be allocated and is $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

Flow aggregating network: Let $(x(e), e \in [n])$ denote the flow through the network in Figure 1. The flow constraints of the network are

$$\begin{aligned} x(e) &\geq 0, e \in [n], \\ x(1) &\leq \alpha(1), \\ x(1) + x(2) &\leq \alpha(1) + \alpha(2), \\ &\vdots \\ x(1) + x(2) + \cdots + x(n) &\leq \alpha(1) + \alpha(2) + \cdots + \alpha(n). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where $\alpha(e) \geq 0$ for all e. The constraints in (58) are referred to as linear ascending constraints. This problem arises as the core optimization problem in several wireless communication problems (Padakandla and Sundaresan [14], Viswanath and Anantharam [15], Lagunas et al. [16], Sanguinetti et al. [17]) and operations research problems (Clark and Scarf [18], Wang [19]). See [20] for a survey and a discussion of several algorithms. The network problem is the maximization of a so-called d-separable concave function over the linear ascending constraints. Veinott Jr. [21] mapped this problem to the geometrical problem of finding the

"concave cover" of the set of points $(\sum_{e=1}^{i} \alpha(e), \sum_{e=1}^{i} p_e),\ i \in [n]$, in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The "string algorithm" of Muckstadt and Sapra [22] finds the concave cover of a set of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$ in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ steps. See [20] for details.

Simulations: We now discuss some simulation studies investigating the speed of convergence of our proposed algorithm. In the plots, the solid curves correspond to the error plots of the system

$$\frac{d}{dt}x(t) \in \kappa \cdot (T(x(t)) - x(t))\,. \tag{59}$$

The dashed curves correspond to the error plots of the system (5)-(7). The differential inclusion (59) has scaling factor κ when compared with (11) and corresponds to a scaled version of Algorithm 1. The scaling is to enable comparison of (59) with the system (5)-(7) which already has the scaling factor κ in (6).



Fig. 2: (a) Error dynamics for (5)-(7) denoted ("KMT") with $\kappa = 1, 2, 10, 50, 100$; error dynamics for (59) denoted "Algorithm 1" with $\kappa = 1$ is also plotted for comparison. (b) The roles of (5)-(7) and (59) are swapped.



Fig. 3: Comparison of error dynamics for the systems (5)-(7) ("KMT" curve) and (59) ("Algorithm 1" curve). Subplot (a) has $\kappa = 1$, (b) has $\kappa = 10$, (c) has $\kappa = 50$, and (d) has $\kappa = 100$. Note that the time axis is scaled differently in each of the subfigures.

All figures are for the flow aggregating network with $n = m = 10$, $\beta(e) = 0.09 \times e, e \in [n]$, and link capacities $c(l) = 10 \times l, l \in [m]$. The initial point for both differential inclusions is always the lexicographically maximal point[3]. This is the most natural starting point when the network does not know the users' utility functions and considers all users to be equal. While we report the results only for this particular β and c, we have simulated several other settings, and the results are qualitatively the same. We do not repeat them here for brevity.

Figure 2(a) shows that as κ scales up, the speed of convergence of the system (5)-(7) increases. For comparison, we have included the solid curve for (59) with $\kappa = 1$.

Figure 2(b) shows that as κ scales up, the rate of convergence of (59) also increases similarly. Again, for comparison, we have included the dashed curve for (5)-(7) with $\kappa = 1$.

[3]The lexicographically maximal point is one where the minimum allocation (across users) is maximized among all feasible points; further the second minimum is maximized among all points with equal minimum allocation, and so on.

These two subfigures show that convergence can be sped up similarly in the two systems, (5)-(7) and (59), by simply increasing κ.

Figures 3(a)-3(d) compare (5)-(7) directly with (59) for identical κ. The speeding up parameter κ equals 1, 10, 50 and 100 in Figures 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), and 3(d) respectively. These figures demonstrate that (59) converges faster than (5)-(7) as long as the κ parameter is identical for the two systems. We saw the same qualitative behavior across several randomly chosen problem parameters.

IV. Conclusion

We considered a network utility maximization problem in a distributed framework where the users do not know the network structure or utility functions of other users and the network does not know the users' utility functions. We decomposed the system problem into user subproblems and a network subproblem following the methodology of [1]. Unlike the dual decomposition iterative methods of [4], [1], [5], etc., the iterations proposed in Algorithm 1 ensure feasibility at every step. The convergence of the algorithm was shown using the theory of differential inclusions. Efficient methods to solve the network problem for some special networks were also described. Finally, sample simulations show that, in several examples, Algorithm 1's associated differential inclusion (11) converges faster to the system optimal point when compared with the iterates arising from the ODE (5)-(7).

Appendix

In this Appendix, we show that there is no selection from within $T(x)$ that could make the selection a single continuous mapping. Consider a special case of $T(x)$ as defined below. Take $w_e(\cdot) = w(\cdot)$ for some increasing and strictly concave $w(\cdot)$. Let

$$T(x) = \arg\max_{y} \sum_{e=1}^{3} p_e(x(e)) \cdot \log(y(e)) \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{subject to} \qquad & y(1) \leq c, \\ & y(1) + y(2) \leq 2c, \\ & y(1) + y(2) + y(3) \leq 3c. \end{aligned}$$

where $p_e(x(e)) = x(e) \cdot w'(x(e)),\ e = 1, 2, 3$. Let $w(\cdot)$ satisfy $x(e) \cdot w'(x(e))|_{x(e)=0} = 0$. Consider $T(x)$ at $x = (c, 0, 0)$. We have

$$T(c, 0, 0) = \{(c, r, s) : r \in [0, c], s \in [0, 2c] : r + s \leq 2c\}.$$

Consider a sequence $y^{(k)} \to x$ such that $y^{(k)}(1) = c,\ y^{(k)}(2) = 0,\ y^{(k)}(3) > 0$ for each k and $\lim_{k\to\infty} y^{(k)}(3) = 0$. It is easy to see that $T(y^{(k)}) = \{(c, 0, 2c)\}$ for each k, and so we must select $(c, 0, 2c)$ at $x = (c, 0, 0)$.

Now, consider another sequence $z^{(k)} \to x$. Let $z^{(k)}(1) = c,\ z^{(k)}(2) = z^{(k)}(3) > 0$ for each k and $\lim_{k\to\infty} z^{(k)}(2) = \lim_{k\to\infty} z^{(k)}(3) = 0$. We then have $T(z^{(k)}) = \{(c, c, c)\}$ for each k, and so we must now select (c, c, c) at $x = (c, 0, 0)$. Since these two selections do not match, T cannot be made continuous at $(c, 0, 0)$ by a choice of a value in $T(c, 0, 0)$.

So T has to be dealt with as a set valued mapping, which brings us to differential inclusions.

REFERENCES

[1] F. P. Kelly, A. K. Maulloo, and D. Tan, "Rate control for communication networks: shadow prices, proportional fairness and stability," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 237–252, 1998.

[2] F. Kelly, "Charging and rate control for elastic traffic," *Eur. Trans. Telecommun.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 33–37, Jan. 1997.

[3] B. Johansson, P. Soldati, and M. Johansson, "Mathematical decomposition techniques for distributed cross-layer optimization of data networks," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1535–1547, 2006.

[4] K. J. Arrow and L. Hurwicz, "On the stability of the competitive equilibrium, I," *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 522–552, 1958.

[5] S. H. Low and D. E. Lapsley, "Optimization flow control-I: basic algorithm and convergence," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 861–874, 1999.

[6] M. Chiang, S. H. Low, A. R. Calderbank, and J. C. Doyle, "Layering as optimization decomposition: A mathematical theory of network architectures," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 255–312, 2007.

[7] D. P. Palomar and M. Chiang, "A tutorial on decomposition methods for network utility maximization," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 24, pp. 1439–1451, 2006.

[8] D. S. Hochbaum, "Lower and upper bounds for the allocation problem and other nonlinear optimization problems," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 390–409, 1994.

[9] R. J. La and V. Anantharam, "Utility-based rate control in the internet for elastic traffic," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 272–286, 2002.

[10] J. Mo and J. Walrand, "Fair end-to-end window-based congestion control," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 556–567, 2000.

[11] M. Benaim, J. Hofbauer, and S. Sorin, "Stochastic approximations and differential inclusions," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 328–348, 2005.

[12] C. Berge, *Topological Spaces: including a treatment of multi-valued functions, vector spaces, and convexity*. Courier Corporation, 1963.

[13] N. Megiddo, "Optimal flows in networks with multiple sources and sinks," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 97–107, 1974.

[14] A. Padakandla and R. Sundaresan, "Power minimization for CDMA under colored noise," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 3103–3112, Oct. 2009.

[15] P. Viswanath and V. Anantharam, "Optimal sequences for CDMA with colored noise: A Schur-saddle function property," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-48, pp. 1295–1318, Jun. 2002.

[16] D. Palomar, M. A. Lagunas, and J. Cioffi, “Optimum linear joint transmit-receive processing for MIMO channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 1179–1197, May 2004.

[17] L. Sanguinetti and A. D’Amico, “Power allocation in two-hop amplify and forward MIMO systems with QoS requirements,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 5, pp. 2494–2507, May 2012.

[18] A. Clark and H. Scarf, “Optimal policies for a multi-echelon inventory problem,” *Mangement Science*, vol. 6, pp. 475–490, 1960.

[19] Z. Wang, “On solving convex optimization problems with linear ascending constraints,” *Optimization Letters*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 819–838, Oct. 2015.

[20] P. T. Akhil and R. Sundaresan, “A survey of algorithms for separable convex optimization with linear ascending constraints,” `http://arxiv.org/abs/1608.08000`, 2016.

[21] A. F. Veinott Jr., “Least d-majorized network flows with inventory and statistical applications,” *Management Science*, vol. 17, pp. 547–567, 1971.

[22] J. A. Muckstadt and A. Sapra, *Principles of Inventory Management*, 2nd ed. Springer, 2010.